LAST CHANCE BEFORE SUBSCRIPTION PRICES GO UP

Only if your envelope is postmarked on or before June 1, 1958 can you EXTEND your HUMAN EVENTS subscription at present bargain prices. Even if your subscription still has one or two years to go, it will pay you to extend it by one to five more years. You need not send any money today. We will bill you for the cost. See coupon on page 4.

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 21 Monday, May 26, 1958 Washington, D. C.

Printed in Two Sections

News Section

NIXON: *Taking aim on 1960*.....(page 1)

BIG SPENDING: *Democrats on the loose*.....(page 2)

Waste at Shippingport.....(page 3)

CALIFORNIA: *Knowland makes gains*.....(page 3)

GOP: *Lessons of 1946*.....(page 4)

Nixon — The Next Phase: What all politicos in the Capital know, but none say publicly, is this: Nixon crossed his Rubicon in Caracas and now must chart his coming — his inevitable — moves toward the election of 1960.

There lingers not the slightest doubt in the minds of any political observer that Nixon's ordeal in South America — whether he realized it or not — pushed him across a decisive bridge in his developing popularity in the United States. Today, he clearly enjoys much greater acclaim than Eisenhower.

Not an eye in congressional cloakrooms failed to read great political significance in the fact that it was Nixon who was chosen to introduce the President when the latter spoke on TV in New York, May 20. The public relations sense of White House Press Secretary Hagerty, remarked one Member of Congress, placed Nixon in that spot — as if to invest Eisenhower with some of the popular glow which Caracas gave to Nixon and to endow the President's waning prestige with some of the young Vice President's new luster.

● However, say political "engineers" in the Capital, political popularity can fade in two years — or even in two months — unless certain required steps are taken. Two necessary preliminaries, they say, are:

(1) Outlining and formulation of a program — worked out in "skull practice" by friends and advisers.

(2) Increasing evidence of the Vice President's allegiance to his "tried and true" political friends. These demonstrably are the right-of-center groups in Congress and in the ranks of the party. Nixon cannot successfully advance save from such a base. The leaders of these groups started and effectively carried through the revolt against a Palace-Guard inspired attempt to sidetrack Nixon away from the Vice Presidency in 1956.

The pay off came last Tuesday in Pennsylvania when the conservative GOP organization, financed and staffed by former Taft people who have sought to protect Nixon in his battles with the left, delivered a crushing blow to the attempt of Harold Stassen (who spearheaded the Modern Republican assault against Nixon in '56) to stage a comeback. Stassen sought the GOP gubernatorial nomination in last Tuesday's primary and was badly defeated at the polls. Yet, it is warned, Stassen is not yet "done for." He still possesses powerful friends within the Eisenhower Administration.

It is no secret in Washington that the Nixon entourage in recent months showed great concern over the developing Stassen campaign. In the last week, their fears of Stassen have manifestly diminished; the lesson of Childe Harold's defeat has not been missed by GOP professionals throughout the country.

● *But, what next? The personable popularity of youth is all very well — say the politicos — but political organization must galvanize it in the many months to come before the final act in the convention of 1960. Those are no idle words. The Republican National Committee cannot provide a satisfactory organization for Nixon so long as Assistant President Sherman Adams maintains a strong hold on that body, by reason of his power over patronage — among other factors. And Adams and Nixon, it is a commonplace, scarcely see eye to eye.*

Hence, the prediction that coming months will see the gradual formation of cadres of a Nixon-for-President movement and that public unveiling of such an organization may come before the year is out. Then — say the far-seeing political prophets — Nixon will have to prepare for the Big Act, the public announcement of his candidacy for the GOP Presidential nomination. When? Probably by September, 1959. ("Betcha Harold announces first," one pro remarked.)

What will all this do to the Sherman Adams hegemony in the White House, and to the various policy areas in which the young aspirant for 1960 will inevitably depart from the course set by the retiring incumbent? The question suggests situations which even the most daring political engineers hesitate to forecast.

Menshikov Go Home! Tempers flare on Capitol Hill as members discuss the situation arising from the attacks on Vice President Nixon in South America. Representative Michael Feighan (D.-Ohio) has demanded that the President declare Russian Ambassador Menshikov *persona non grata* and have him "removed from the American scene." Feighan emphasized that Menshikov, since his advent to Washington serveral months ago, has spread palpably false Soviet propaganda and has even dared to go over the heads of the President and Cabinet in making "a direct appeal to Congress to prevent the rearming of the free and demo-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic German Federal Republic" — thereby violating "protocol and long standing diplomatic precedent," all in "a crude effort to cause dissension and political disunity on the American scene."

The Ohio Congressman also pointed out how quickly the Moscow Government ousted John A. Baker, Jr., of our Embassy in the Soviet Capital, apparently because he made friends with Russian students at Moscow University — thereby rendering ludicrous the whole system of US-Soviet "cultural exchanges."

Other members of Congress sum up the Caracas incident — from which Nixon barely emerged with his life — as what ought to be the "last straw." One observer asked: "How silly can you get when we tolerate Menshikov and continue to recognize Russia, after the Moscow apparatus insolently tried to bring about the assassination of our own Vice President?" Leaders of the House are reminded that in the hopper of that legislative body is a proposed bill (H. Con. Res. 116), sponsored by Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.), who died in January, to authorize a joint congressional committee for the purpose of "studying all aspects of the question of severance of diplomatic, economic, cultural and all other relations between the US and Soviet Russia." The late Congressman was known as an advocate of breaking relations with Moscow. Friends are pressing the House Rules Committee to initiate some action concerning this bill.

New Atomic Chief? Capitol corridors are buzzing with speculation that Ike has chosen a new Atomic Energy Commission Chairman to replace incumbent Chairman Lewis Strauss, old-line Republican and friend of the late Senator Taft.

Last week it was noted that President Eisenhower had a conference with Gordon Gray, first appointed to office in the Defense Department by President Truman, now Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Gray is a North Carolina Democrat. It has been frequently rumored that Strauss will soon resign — after a campaign carried on against him by congressional Democrats, notably Senator Clinton Anderson (N.M.), head of the powerful Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Speculation has spread that Gray will succeed Strauss. If that happens, it is pointed out, the Atomic Energy Commission membership will be composed of three Democrats, one Republican and one member of indeterminate (but "liberal") political complexion. Republicans in the cloakroom ask why Ike — or Sherman Adams — does not name a Republican, preferably a conservative Republican, to maintain some sort of political balance.

(There appear to be the makings of a GOP revolt on Capitol Hill to keep Strauss in.)

Latin America: Former Ambassador to Cuba Spruille Braden — who at one time also headed the State Department's Division of Latin American Affairs — last week tossed some probing questions into a Capital still seething, with controversy and indignation, over the experience of Vice President Nixon during his recent tour of Latin America.

Braden turned the spotlight of skeptical inquiry on to one of the most secretive — and suspect — agencies of the Government, Allen Dulles' Central Intelligence Agency. (Among Capital conservatives, Allen Dulles' popularity rating is considerably lower than that of his brother, the Secretary of State.)

Commenting on the Nixon affair to HUMAN EVENTS last week, Braden posed the question: "What were the CIA's representatives in each of the republics doing? Did they sound timely warnings, or was CIA taken off guard?"

Braden's commentary also encompassed the controversial subject of foreign aid. "Responsible Latin Americans," he said, want neither "to be propagandized by the USIA nor supported by grants from ICA [the foreign-aid agency]." Braden quoted at length to HUMAN EVENTS from a letter penned by an Argentine industrialist. This letter reads, in part:

> There has been widely spread amongst the Latin American countries the concept of the "moral obligation" on the United States to help with dollars in resolving the economic and financial problems of our peoples . . . Also, the idea is spread that there is a "moral right" to demand it.
>
> As a citizen of a poor, or temporarily poor country, if I may be permitted to be proud, I maintain that that "right" and that "obligation" are humiliating. Each country must do its best to resolve its own problems by itself . . . if it [needs] aid from the outside, it should start by creating such favorable conditions as to attract the aid from private sources. . . .
>
> The cold indiscriminate aid given because your Congress authorizes it is a corrupting and impoverishing influence. . . .

● A capacity audience was on hand at the National Press Club last week to hear a talk by Vice President Nixon, who discussed the events of his recent trip in some detail. Some national press coverage of this talk gave the impression that Nixon, in his comments, discounted the Communist influence behind the attacks upon him. This was not the case. Nixon remarked that economic and political conditions existed in Latin American countries which enabled the Communists to recruit "spear-carriers"; but he made a definite point of the fact that the attacks were organized and led by Communists, and that they did not represent the true feelings of the countries involved. He moreover listed a number of tell-tale signs proving beyond doubt the fact that the incidents were trumped up by Communists.

These were the clues that gave away the Communist game: (1) the demonstrators used slogans characteristic of the international Communist conspiracy, but not of Latin America — *i.e.*, attacking nuclear weapons tests; (2) they jeered not only during the playing of the American national anthem, but during the anthem of their own nation; (3) they insulted Mrs. Nixon — an act repugnant to deeply held Latin notions of chivalry, but not to Red terrorists.

The man ticking off these points — say political scorekeepers — was "the old Nixon," the man who fought the anti-Communist battle in 1948.

Spender from Wisconsin: "Liberal" Democratic elements in Congress are once more indulging their favorite addiction — bigger and wilder spending proposals for every conceivable purpose. Capital observers seeking to identify the bellwether in this irresponsible tableau cite the performance of freshman Senator William Proxmire (D.-Wis.), who was elected to the Senate last year when Dairy State conservatives repudiated Modern Republican Walter Kohler.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Proxmire, points out Representative John Byrnes (R.-Wis.), "in four short months" of the current session, "has introduced bills which would deplete the Federal treasury at the rate of over $23 billion annually." Byrnes offers a statistical table covering 13 separate bills, showing in detail how Proxmire proposes to plunder the Federal exchequer.

Byrnes comments that Proxmire's $23 billion in spending proposals "is more money than the 45 million Americans who earn $10,000 a year or less pay in Federal income taxes each year. Proxmire's bills, if enacted, would raise the anticipated $8 billion 1959 deficit to over $31 million. This one-year deficit would surpass, by more than $5 billion, the entire deficit piled up by FDR during the first eight years of the New Deal."

As further commentary on "liberal" Democratic performance at this session, Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) told HUMAN EVENTS last week: "Under the cover of Sputnik and the recession, the Democrats in both houses, according to all indications, have made proposals to spend over $200 billion of the taxpayers' money. This wild spending must be halted."

Other legislators confide that the spending drive under way this session is the most intensive they have experienced in recent years. Public action — in the form of letters demanding economy, a sharp curtailment of foreign aid, *etc.* — is urgently needed.

Education Front: Activity on behalf of Federal spending in the field of college scholarships was stepped up markedly during the past week. A compromise bill pending in the House Committee on Education and Labor has marshalled strong support, receiving favorable action last week by two education subcommittees; and deputy commissioner of education Wayne R. Reed journeyed to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, held in Omaha, Nebraska, to urge support for scholarship legislation. He stated that innumerable thousands of students were forced to discontinue their schooling for financial reasons.

The past few days, however, have also seen some contrary developments. A series of three articles in *The Washington Daily News* stressed a point refuting Reed's remarks, and one made frequently in these columns — that there is a wealth of college scholarship aid available for needy students, much of it unsubscribed, and any student willing to put in some extra effort should be able to get a college education. "With So Many Scholarships," asked the *News*' opening headline, "How Can Anyone Miss College?" (See HUMAN EVENTS for March 17 and March 24, 1958.)

Meanwhile, Reed's speech drew the fire of Representative Ralph Gwinn (R.-N.Y.), a leading opponent of Federal involvement in education. Gwinn gave this comment to HUMAN EVENTS, concerning the education official's pleading before the PTA:

"Regarding Mr. Reed and other officials of the US Office of Education going about the country to make speeches before associations of parents and teachers and other groups, at taxpayers' expense, to get the Office of Education more power and participation in education — that is contrary to the function of the Federal Government (see 18 USC 1913).

"*It is unlawful for any department of the Federal Government to publicize and propagandize its services, to build up appropriations for itself. It is contrary to law, unless appropriations are made specifically for the purpose. Certainly no appropriations of taxpayers' money have been made to support Mr. Reed's trip to Omaha for publicizing the benefits of the Federal Government's interference with, and influence on, education.*

Atomic White Elephant: President Eisenhower is scheduled to participate, May 26, in the dedication of what may eventually prove — according to some observers — to be the most expensive "white elephant" in American history. This is the much publicized atomic-power-producing reactor at Shippingport, Pa.

Although the project, set up to produce power for civilian needs, is supposed to be non-secret, it is difficult to obtain all the relevant facts concerning it. From those statistics which are available, however, it becomes apparent that the bill for the taxpayers is formidable. It has been officially announced that the cost exceeds $121 million. This figure does not include the cost of the fuel or of the insurance which the Government furnishes. Since the plant has a rated capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, it is obvious that the cost per installed kilowatt runs to over $2000, as contrasted with $145 per installed kilowatt of a modern coal-burning plant.

Even the designers and operators admit that the cost of operation per kilowatt hour will be over 70 mills — in an area where electricity can be purchased for 5 mills per kilowatt hour. Other technicians claim that the actual cost for this plant will probably come to more than 100 mills.

In short, Shippingport will lose over $20 million annually — assuming that it operates for a full year. There may be some question about such full-scale operation. For the reactor, which commenced running in December, 1957, has so far (according to AEC figures) performed for a cumulative total of only 17 days.

Business circles in Washington point out: (1) that the Federal Government is spending a great deal of money on an atomic plant placed squarely on top of a coal field in one of the cheapest electric power-producing areas of the world; and (2) that the plant is producing electricity for 20 times the price in the open market.

California Report: Senator Knowland continues to sweep onward in his developing counterattack against the Democrats and "modern" elements within his own party. Informants on the Coast tell HUMAN EVENTS that the Senator, by his vigorous advocacy of labor-reform legislation, gains strength week by week.

It is noted that his attempt to put over amendments affording real, tough labor reform (on Democratic bills of the "sweetheart" variety) has succeeded in placing Democratic Senators on the spot. Their rank-and-file constituents want these reforms. Therefore, it is not surprising that even Senator John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), who has favored "sweetheart bills," is now appropriating and backing some of the very amendments which Knowland favored.

Knowland's California situation has greatly improved in the past two weeks, since Governor Goodwin Knight was so indiscreet as to criticize Knowland in remarks made at a meeting in Pasadena. These remarks have boomeranged. Now it is felt in San Francisco that Knight — as a result of adverse reactions — may lose his race for the Senatorial nomination to GOP Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco, his opponent in the Republican primary. Knight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is said to have become nettled at Knowland's progress — which caused his outburst at the Pasadena meeting.

GOP and the Press: Washingtonians read with interest the results of a Gallup poll testing current political sentiment among the American people. The poll revealed that public esteem for the Republican party has reached a low ebb. If elections were held now, said Gallup, only 42 per cent of those questioned would favor the GOP's taking power in Congress. The Gallup story — as carried in the Capital by the left-wing Washington *Post*—ended with this paragraph: "In the 1946 campaign, the Democrats, early in the year, had a margin of 55 per cent to 45 per cent for the GOP in [Gallup] Institute surveys."

Those who make a point of reading out-of-town papers, however, note that the *Post* version omitted further comment from Gallup which showed that the Republicans have a striking precedent for looking optimistically to this fall's elections. The two succeeding paragraphs in the Gallup article, omitted by the *Post*, read as follows:

> **"But the tide swung in the midsummer of 1946 — with many voters disillusioned about the postwar labor situation — and the final results in November saw the Republicans winning 54.3 per cent of the vote nationwide and 246 seats in the House of Representatives.**

"A comparable shift in the vote this year would give the GOP just over a majority of the popular votes."

Lesson drawn by GOP well-wishers in the Capital: the Gallup figures are not a cause for despair, but a signal to drive home the issues with the same militancy that turned the tide in 1946.

Business in Politics: A powerful wave of sentiment, nationwide in its dimensions, is forming behind the move to increase business participation in political activity. A flood of reports of programs at the grass-roots level have reached HUMAN EVENTS in recent days, indicating that substantial beginnings have been made toward overtaking the labor bosses' long lead in the field of practical politics.

The move to counteract union pressures with hard-hitting grass-roots action first received extensive public treatment in HUMAN EVENTS for April 7, 1958, in an article entitled, "Men to Match My Mountains," by James M. Brewbaker. Recently, the Washington research organization, Congressional Quarterly, took notice of the growing movement, focussing on the recent remarks of Congressman Gwinn (R.-N.Y.) and Senator Goldwater (R.-Ariz.).

A CQ survey of sentiment about political action among business organizations showed that Rowland Jones, Jr., president of the American Retail Federation, has seized the initiative in urging business involvement in politics. "The members of the business and professional community," Jones said recently, "must shed their aversion to participation in political affairs . . . They must recognize that accomplishments in the manufacturing, marketing and professional areas can be cancelled out by adverse actions in the political forums." Jones last month urged the formation of a federation of business and professional men to counteract labor's power.

A CQ spot-check of business associations revealed some foot-dragging on Jones' idea, but struck a spark of enthusiasm from William Jackman, President of the Investors' League. Such a federation, Jackman said early this month, is "the only answer to ruthless Reuther."

Book Front: A book called *The Chains of Fear* (Henry Regnery Company; $4.75), containing a sharp critique of the Communist system, will reach an audience of over five million people, on the occasion of its serialization in *The Saturday Evening Post.* The first installment appeared in the *Post* for May 24.

The Chains of Fear is the story of a Communist functionary who becomes disenchanted with the Soviet system, in the course of his grim duties for the secret police. Written by Russian émigré N. Narokov, the new book is being acclaimed as a first-rate literary event of 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS SUBSCRIPTION RATES GO UP.
ACT NOW — TO SAVE.

All publications have been forced by higher costs to raise their subscription rates. The Kiplinger Washington Letter, for example, has just raised its subscription rates to $24 a year. This has become the prevailing price for Washington newsletters, so that even at its new rates, HUMAN EVENTS is the lowest priced newsletter in the Capital. ***Before putting the higher rates into effect, we are giving our loyal subscribers a chance to EXTEND their current subscriptions for as long as 5 years at present bargain rates. Fill out coupon below:***

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please EXTEND my subscription for the period marked.

CHECK SERVICE DESIRED	Rate June 1	Renew NOW at	
☐ 1 year subscription	$11	$10	Saving you $1
☐ 2 year subscription	22	17	Saving you $5
☐ 3 year subscription	33	23	Saving you $10
☐ 4 year subscription	44	29	Saving you $15
☐ 5 year subscription	55	34	Saving you $21

☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me ☐ Bill my company

By first class mail US, Canada: $2 year additional. By airmail, $4 year additional. FOREIGN second class: $14 a year. AIRMAIL Europe, Latin America $21 a year. AIRMAIL Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

YOU can make BIG SAVINGS if you now extend your subscription for two to five years

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101 Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.

LUDWIG VON MISES, Professor of Economics, New York University: "HUMAN EVENTS is the best source of information about what is going on in American politics. Its analyses are unsurpassed in keenness and integrity. It is indispensable for anybody who wants to form an independent judgment on current affairs."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

- **Yearly rate,** $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
- **By first class mail,** $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
- **Bound Annual Volume for 1957,** with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
- **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**
- **The Declaration of Independence opens:** "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher* M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 21 HUMAN EVENTS May 26, 1958

Article Section I

If you agree with the thesis of this important article, write your Congressman and your Senators, urging them to support the Jenner-Butler bill. This bill, S. 2646, contains the following provisions for counteracting recent harmful decisions by the Supreme Court: (1) to make advocacy of violent overthrow of the Government a crime under the Smith Act, irrespective of how immediate such overthrow would be; (2) to allow states to prosecute for subversion unless such action is expressly forbidden by Congress; (3) to prevent Supreme Court review of state regulations governing admission to the bar; (4) to restore congressional investigating powers concerning the latitude of questions put to witnesses.

WHY CONGRESS MUST CURB THE COURT

Action Is Needed to Restore Constitutional Government

By PAUL JONES

IT IS a matter of grade-school knowledge that our Constitution provides for a system of checks and balances. Yet the mere hint that Congress is preparing to assert its proper powers, as in the Jenner-Butler proposals to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, is enough to excite a sheeplike chorus of alarmed baa-ing from the "liberal" establishment. The phenomenon deserves prayerful attention, as a symbol of decadence.

Somewhat more than 1900 years ago, the Emperor Caligula appointed his horse to be a consul, the highest honor to which a citizen of the Roman Republic could aspire. History shows no record of any popular anger or alarm aroused by the nomination. Lord Chesterfield, a student of politics and public opinion, believed that people's minds, in Imperial Rome after the reign of Tiberius, had been conditioned to accept anything imposed on them with a show of executive authority. That a horse might serve as one of the presiding officers of the august Roman Senate could not disturb them. They were in a state of shock.

Judging by our own experience, it is possible to imagine some of the comments that must have been made by right-thinking publicists of Caligula's day. A Roscius would point out ponderously that a good horse was far better than a bad man, and no one could deny that many bad men had been consuls. Then, too, as Josephus might observe, this was no ordinary horse. The mere fact that he enjoyed the Emperor's confidence was recommendation enough. Besides, he was a well-travelled horse, familiar with conditions in the lands across the Danube and in Asia Minor.

You can be sure that the dinner couches of Rome buzzed with the approval of all honest folk, members of the Council on Barbarian Relations. Any one who ventured to wonder out loud whether the consulship was just the right spot for a horse met with raised eyebrows from the enlightened. He must be anti-horse, out of sheer prejudice, or bent maliciously on smearing a noble animal, Caligula's best friend.

Although Rome had an emperor, it was still in form a republic. Its rulers sometimes followed, but more often ignored, its constitutional procedures. In its origin, the word "emperor" was merely "imperator," that is, "commander-in-chief." Thoughtful observers in present-day America may meditate usefully on the growing practice of asserting unusual powers and privileges for the President, *because* he is Commander-in-chief.

It began with President Roosevelt, who sent troops and ships anywhere he pleased, before this country entered the late world war. President Truman continued and amplified the practice. The title "commander-in-chief" is one he loves to recall. Under its wide powers, unhampered by any constitutional limit, he claimed the right to seize the steel industry with as little ceremony as Captain Truman of the Field Artillery might have taken over a billet in a French farmhouse 40 years ago.

Mr. Eisenhower has extended the theory. Nothing in constitutional practice justified the Little Rock intervention except the fact that the President, in his capacity of imperator, could send troops wherever he pleased, on any pretext or none. Moreover, federalizing a State National Guard, in time of peace, merely to remove it from the control of the Governor, and without the consent of the state government, runs counter to the statutory law formulated by Congress on the subject. Yet in this case Congress was not even consulted, unless chatting with a few selected Senators and Representatives is an acceptable substitute for laying a problem formally before the most powerful branch of the Federal Government.

THE NATURE OF OUR American system is so little understood these days that most people hardly realize that the Congress is supposed to hold the top hand. The men who wrote the Constitution designed a regime of checks and balances. But they were not so foolish as to provide for built-in deadlocks. They knew that ultimate power must reside somewhere, and they chose to lodge it in the place where it belongs — the branch chosen by the people in states and Congressional Districts.

The proof of this proposition is simple. Consider this: any member of the Executive and Judicial arms,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

including the President and the Chief Justice, may be impeached by the House and removed from office, if found guilty, by the Senate. But no power on earth — so far — can unseat a Senator or a Representative, except an adverse vote of his constituents or of his peers in the Senate or the House. Outside the basic electoral process, Congress alone is the judge of its members' fitness for elective office. And Congress is the sole court in which a President or a Justice of the Supreme Court may be brought to the bar of justice.

No one can seriously contend that this far-reaching power should be exercised capriciously or over minor differences of opinion. Congress has shown the greatest forbearance under continued provocation. Yet how capricious have the Executive and Judicial Branches become! Without any reasonable excuse, they refuse information to Congress, alleging a mythical, sacrosanct tradition, supposed to hallow the meanest deliberations of pettifogging bureaucrats. So might a Roman Emperor, in his role as Pontifex Maximus, have shielded from the profane his less edifying shenanigans as well as the solemn rites of the Vestal Virgins.

The Supreme Court presumes to strip Congress of its investigating power (incidentally, the only one that can lead to rational impeachments) by conferring on witnesses the privilege of determining for themselves whether a question is irrelevant, incompetent and immaterial. It treats states' rights as if they were mere superstition, preferring the lucubrations of a Swedish sociologist to the plain teaching of tradition and common sense.

The White House and the Supreme Court have lost the sense of proportion which a right understanding of the division of powers should keep constantly in mind. Congress has been, and is, notably slow to reassert its role in Government. It is perhaps for that very reason that the Constitutional Convention gave to Congress the ultimate, overwhelming reservoir of power, so that it might not be misused in haste or anger.

Yet now, when members consider limitations on the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as the Constitution provides, people are astonished. The effect is something like the surprise produced by the revolt of a henpecked and long-suffering husband. Everybody had forgotten that Congress had any rights, let alone pre-eminent powers.

If Congress failed to stand up in its own defense, it would find eventually that the Legislative Branch had been reduced to a cipher, as the Roman Senate was. The checks and balances of the Constitution are not self-executing. Each arm of the Government is supposed to protect itself resolutely at all times. An authority on constitutional law, Professor Corwin, has said that the Supreme Court is spoiling for a tweak of its august nose. And what power in the land except Congress can pull the nose of the Supreme Court?

The present excessive power and influence of the Executive were either authorized by short-sighted Congressional action in the past, or allowed to continue by equally short-sighted inaction as of today. It is useless, for example, to criticize Treasury agents for padlocking neighborhood dry-goods stores and levying on pay envelopes for trifling income tax debts. Congress gave them that power, and could withdraw it at any time, by a simple amendment of the law.

ONE OBSTACLE to a cool reappraisal of the wisdom of delegating so much power to the Executive is the fashion for fatalism. This is the trend, say the experts, in considering the gradual transformation of the American system. You can't buck history. The Executive *must* become more and more puissant, as the Roman Emperors did; the Congress *must* be transformed into a subservient claque, as the Roman Senate was.

Yet there are other, more modern and more cogent, examples, to show how a few resolute leaders in a parliamentary assembly can restore its prestige and dignity, to the applause of the people, who have far more sense and far less defeatist ideas than the average intellectual. In 1770, for instance, Edmund Burke published his "Thoughts On The Cause of the Present Discontents," a strong indictment of political trends under George III. The theme was: "The power of the Crown, almost dead and rotten as Prerogative, has grown up anew, with much more strength, and far less odium, under the name of Influence." There must have been plenty of people to say that Burke was swimming hopelessly against the tide, that the whole trend of history was against him, that you can't turn back the clock, and that Edmund was the sort of person who had to be carried, kicking and screaming, into the new era.

Yet ten years later, in 1780, John Dunning, a member from Devonshire, rose in the House of Commons, and made a motion, as follows: "That the influence of the Crown was increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

The motion passed by 18 votes, in spite of the strenuous objections of the Cabinet and the whole right-thinking establishment. The tide was reversed; history was changed. Is it too much to hope that the American Congress, led by able and patriotic members, can show an equal sense of their duty and their pre-eminent powers?

Paul Jones has been an editorial writer for the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* for the past dozen years. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Where Do We Go From Here? — A Republican Looks at What's Left of His Party," August 17, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "WHY CONGRESS MUST CURB THE COURT," at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name .....

Street .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 21 HUMAN EVENTS May 26, 1958

Article Section II

THE RIGHT TO WORK

The Moral and Religious Point of View

By THE REV. JOHN E. COOGAN, S.J.

Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Detroit

SEVERAL YEARS AGO, a group of 25 Catholic archbishops and bishops issued a statement touching upon the "secularizing" effect of many modern labor unions. A labor organization, said this statement, can be "formative," in a Christian way, "if it expressly adheres . . . to the social principles of Christianity . . . Otherwise the association will lead the worker astray to materialism; it will imbue him with a false concept of life eventually made known by harsh claims, unjust methods, and the omission of collaboration necessary to the common good." (This statement, known as the "1950 Joint Pastoral" of the archbishops and bishops of the Civil Province of Quebec, was approved by the appropriate authorities in Rome.)

Our American type of unionism of course makes no claim that it "expressly adheres . . . to the social principles of Christianity." In the United States no such type of union is possible. But the Pastoral warns us solemnly of the grave evils the neutral union involves. A workman may join such a union and do his best to prevent or to minimize those evils. But he may properly call upon us to help save him from being *forced* into such an association.

Two years ago I published an article in favor of the right-to-work law, in which I used that Pastoral as partial evidence. One of the priest foes of the law wrote me that my article had the National Association of Manufacturers' "slant." I replied that if he would read the Rome-approved Pastoral for himself he would find that it too had the National Association of Manufacturers' "slant."

To verify the contention of the Pastoral that our largely secularized unionism is harmful to the religious spirit of its members we have not far to look. We find Allan S. Haywood, late Executive Vice President of the CIO, declaring: "When you join a union, it's kind of like joining a church. You work for nothing else and you believe in nothing else." No wonder then that Father Philip Carey, S.J., apostle of New York's Xavier Labor School, warns us, from many years' experience: "The philosophy of secularism is a greater present problem to American labor than communism." As a confirmation of that charge we have only to recall the reception given Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa in the last shameful Teamsters convention in Miami.

Those two leaders, under indictment for alleged multiple and criminal betrayal of trust, had clammed up or suffered unheard of mental blackouts in the Senate McClellan investigation. And yet their entrance into the packed convention hall met with the acclaim of a "Hail, the conquering hero comes." Those union delegates were largely heads of families, men actively concerned in their home communities with questions of juvenile delinquency and public morals. Yet in that convention they compounded charged and documented felonies that would have disgraced Ali Baba's 40 Thieves – and that in the name of union loyalty.

FURTHER TESTIMONY to the destruction of religious and moral spirit that comes from neutral unionism we have from the distinguished and fair-minded Jewish labor economist, Will Herberg. He charges that "the lack of a labor conscience . . . is, in a sense, the basic problem of American trade unionism." "The problem," he says, is one of "double morality, one ethic for private life and another for the organization involved." Herberg goes on to say that there has been "little religion operative in the lives of the leaders and rank-and-file workers alike in their capacity as members of the labor movement." He says that with the non-Catholic unionists the relevance of their religions to their labor activities "never so much as enters their minds." And as to the Catholics, the divorce between their religions and their labor activities has been almost total.

The secularization process that our unionism effects in the activities of our workmen is notably productive of the bitter class spirit so often found. The union spirit of hostility towards the employer is no accidental or recent creation. It was "built into" the American union movement.

Ed Marciniak tells us that during the entire independent existence of the AFL (that is, from 1881 to the formation of the AFL-CIO in 1955), the opening sentence of the AFL constitution dedicated the organization to the class struggle: "A struggle is going on in all the nations of the civilized world, between the oppressors and the oppressed of all countries, a struggle between the capitalist and the laborer, which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results to the toiling millions, if they are not combined for mutual protection and benefit."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps the most damaging admission that I have seen of this bitter class spirit appeared in the pro-unionist weekly magazine, *Commonweal,* a year or so ago. There we were told that "many times it is difficult not to get the impression during labor-management negotiations that the workers cannot wait to go out on strike and are reluctant to go back to work. It has been pointed out that men strike not so much for better wages, hours and conditions, but simply to express their deep hatred of their employers, their work and their way of life."

If such is the fruit of American unionism, why should the reluctant workman, who wishes only to make an honest living, be forced into such association? Why *must* he join the ranks of such unionism and be subjected to the influence and discipline of its leaders?

Violence as an element in union policy is almost too well known to be mentioned here, but at the same time it gives us some measure of the moral and religious damage done union members through their loyalty to their secular-minded leaders. This violence is freely exercised even against so-called "union brothers" in a jurisdictional dispute. A classic example of the sort occurred a year or so ago in Grand Blanc, Michigan, in a battle between pipefitters and riggers. The riggers, wearing steel helmets, fell upon their opponents with chains, wrenches, and steel pipes ("only steel can do so many jobs so well"); eleven of the pipefitters were hospitalized, one with a depression fracture of the skull. When religion tells us that "he that hates his brother is a murderer," no exception is made for jurisdictional disputes.

In spite of such damage done to the moral and religious spirit of the unionist, many conscientious people favor compulsory unionism because they think it essential to the union movement. But, as J. C. Gibson, Vice President and General Counsel of the Santa Fe Railway, points out: "Compulsory union membership is illegal or under attack in practically every country of the free world. It is invalid by constitution, statute, or judicial decision in France, Western Germany, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden. The labor party in Australia recently decided to drop compulsory unionism from its platform." Compulsory unionism continues unchallenged in only one country — the USSR, the land of compulsion. The rest of the free world almost without exception maintains the union movement without a pattern of compulsion. Why should we not be able to do as well?

IN MY OPPOSITION to compulsory unionism I have good company among social moralists of the highest repute. Father Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Dean of the School of Sacred Theology of the Catholic University of America, tells us: "I still hold the view I expressed in June, 1947 — that there is no Catholic principle to the effect that every worker is bound to join the union. Neither do I believe that there is any Catholic principle which condemns the right-to-work law."

The late Cardinal Griffin of England, a great friend of labor unionism, flatly declared: "We do not want introduced into this country compulsory membership in a trade union, which I am convinced would do more harm than good to the trade unions themselves."

I have been accused of not sufficiently appreciating the helpful influence of George Meany on the union scene. I hold him to be a Christian gentleman of great ability and integrity. Meany could not publicly acknowledge that he would be grateful for much legislation against irresponsible unionism, but he would be the first and chief beneficiary. In any case, he is aging, is overburdened with his labors, and may be gone from us tomorrow. Who would his successor be?

Many, of course, think it would be Walter Reuther. What change would that make in the union setup? We all know that Reuther has been very energetic about rooting racketeering out of unionism. But he does not show the same hostility to violence as a union tactic. Is violence any less deplorable than racketeering? Most of us would rather be robbed than mobbed. I for one would look forward with dread to the day when Walter Reuther, raised to the leadership of American labor, should become the exemplar of American unionism.

Then indeed would be verified the prediction of the Quebec Pastoral, that the example of a dynamic leader secularly motivated and guided "will lead the worker astray to materialism; . . . imbue him with a false concept of life eventually made known by harsh claims, unjust methods, and the omission of the collaboration necessary to the common good." Then if ever would we need a right-to-work law to save the American workman from the compulsory domination of that influence.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE RIGHT TO WORK," at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name .....

Street .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED